

ALAN WATT
ON
"WORLD REVIEW COMMENTARY"
WITH
GEORGE BUTLER & CHARLOTTE LITTLEFIELD BROWN
November 25, 2007

(Originally Aired Live on
"We The People Radio Network" - Nov. 25, 2007)

WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM

www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

George: Welcome to Waldorf Astoria. Today is April 27, 1961. I'm George Butler reporting and joining me is Charlotte Brown.

Charlotte: Thank you, George. In a few moments our President John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be addressing the Newspapers Publishers Association. Our President will be giving a speech entitled "The President and the Press."

George: Charlotte, according to our advanced copy it appears this speech might be somewhat controversial. What's your view of this speech?

Charlotte: Yes, George, I do believe it might be controversial.

George: Yes. It seems that it lays down in explicit terms the battles ahead. Now, the President of the United States.

JOHN F. KENNEDY APRIL 27, 1961 SPEECH

The President and the Press: American Newspaper Publishers Association
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York

Ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate very much your generous invitation to be here tonight.

You bear heavy responsibilities these days and an article I read some time ago reminded me of how particularly heavily the burdens of present day events bear upon your profession.

You may remember that in 1851 the New York Herald Tribune, under the sponsorship and publishing of Horace Greeley, employed as its London correspondent an obscure journalist by the name of Karl Marx.

We are told that foreign correspondent Marx, stone broke, and with a family ill and undernourished, constantly appealed to Greeley and Managing Editor Charles Dana for an increase in his munificent salary of \$5 per installment, a salary which he and Engels ungratefully labeled as the "lousiest petty bourgeois cheating."

But when all his financial appeals were refused, Marx looked around for other means of livelihood and fame, eventually terminating his relationship with the Tribune and devoting his talents full time to the cause that would bequeath to the world the seeds of Leninism, Stalinism, revolution and the cold war.

If only this capitalistic New York newspaper had treated him more kindly; if only Marx had remained a foreign correspondent, history might have been different. And I hope all publishers will bear this lesson in mind the next time they receive a poverty-stricken appeal for a small increase in the expense account from an obscure newspaper man.

I have selected as the title of my remarks tonight "The President and the Press." Some may suggest that this would be more naturally worded "The President Versus the Press." But those are not my sentiments tonight.

It is true, however, that when a well-known diplomat from another country demanded recently that our State Department repudiate certain newspaper attacks on his colleague it was unnecessary for us to reply that this Administration was not responsible for the press, for the press had already made it clear that it was not responsible for this Administration.

Nevertheless, my purpose here tonight is not to deliver the usual assault on the so-called one-party press. On the contrary, in recent months I have rarely heard any complaints about political bias in the press except from a few Republicans. Nor is it my purpose tonight to discuss or defend the televising of Presidential press conferences. I think it is highly beneficial to have some 20,000,000 Americans regularly sit in on these conferences to observe, if I may say so, the incisive, the intelligent and the courteous qualities displayed by your Washington correspondents.

Nor, finally, are these remarks intended to examine the proper degree of privacy which the press should allow to any President and his family.

If in the last few months your White House reporters and photographers have been attending church services with regularity that has surely done them no harm.

On the other hand, I realize that your staff and wire service photographers may be complaining that they do not enjoy the same green privileges at the local golf courses which they once did.

It is true that my predecessor did not object as I do to pictures of one's golfing skill in action. But neither on the other hand did he ever bean a Secret Service man. My topic tonight is a more sober one of concern to publishers as well as editors.

I want to talk about our common responsibilities in the face of a common danger. The events of recent weeks may have helped to illuminate that challenge for some; but the dimensions of its threat have loomed large on the horizon for many years. Whatever our hopes may be for the future--for reducing this threat or living with it--there is no escaping either the gravity or the totality of its challenge to our survival and to our security--a challenge that confronts us in unaccustomed ways in every sphere of human activity.

This deadly challenge imposes upon our society two requirements of direct concern

both to the press and to the President--two requirements that may seem almost contradictory in tone, but which must be reconciled and fulfilled if we are to meet this national peril. I refer, first, to the need for far greater public information; and, second, to the need for far greater official secrecy.

The very word "secrecy" is repugnant in a free and open society; and we are as a people inherently and historically opposed to secret societies, to secret oaths and to secret proceedings. We decided long ago that the dangers of excessive and unwarranted concealment of pertinent facts far outweighed the dangers which are cited to justify it. Even today, there is little value in opposing the threat of a closed society by imitating its arbitrary restrictions. Even today, there is little value in insuring the survival of our nation if our traditions do not survive with it. And there is very grave danger that an announced need for increased security will be seized upon by those anxious to expand its meaning to the very limits of official censorship and concealment. That I do not intend to permit to the extent that it's in my control. And no official of my Administration, whether his rank is high or low, civilian or military, should interpret my words here tonight as an excuse to censor the news, to stifle dissent, to cover up our mistakes or to withhold from the press and the public the facts they deserve to know.

But I do ask every publisher, every editor, and every newsman in the nation to reexamine his own standards, and to recognize the nature of our country's peril. In time of war, the government and the press have customarily joined in an effort, based largely on self-discipline, to prevent unauthorized disclosures to the enemy. In time of "clear and present danger," the courts have held that even the privileged rights of the First Amendment must yield to the public's need for national security.

Today no war has been declared--and however fierce the struggle may be, it may never be declared in the traditional fashion. Our way of life is under attack. Those who make themselves our enemy are advancing around the globe. The survival of our friends is in danger. And yet no war has been declared, no borders have been crossed by marching troops, no missiles have been fired.

If the press is awaiting a declaration of war before it imposes the self-discipline of combat conditions, then I can only say that no war ever posed a greater threat to our security. If you are awaiting a finding of "clear and present danger," then I can only say that the danger has never been more clear and its presence has never been more imminent.

It requires a change in outlook, a change in tactics, a change in missions--by the government, by the people, by every businessman or labor leader, and by every newspaper. For we are opposed around the world by a monolithic and ruthless conspiracy that relies primarily on covert means for expanding its sphere of influence--on infiltration instead of invasion, on subversion instead of elections, on intimidation instead of free choice, on guerrillas by night instead of armies by day. It is a system which has conscripted vast human and material resources into the building of a tightly knit, highly efficient machine that combines military, diplomatic, intelligence, economic, scientific and political operations.

Its preparations are concealed, not published. Its mistakes are buried, not headlined. Its dissenters are silenced, not praised. No expenditure is questioned, no rumor is printed, no secret is revealed. It conducts the Cold War, in short, with a war-time discipline no democracy would ever hope or wish to match.

Nevertheless, every democracy recognizes the necessary restraints of national security--and the question remains whether those restraints need to be more strictly observed if we are to oppose this kind of attack as well as outright invasion.

For the facts of the matter are that this nation's foes have openly boasted of acquiring through our newspapers information they would otherwise hire agents to acquire through theft, bribery or espionage; that details of this nation's covert preparations to counter the enemy's covert operations have been available to every newspaper reader, friend and foe alike; that the size, the strength, the location and the nature of our forces and weapons, and our plans and strategy for their use, have all been pinpointed in the press and other news media to a degree sufficient to satisfy any foreign power; and that, in at least one case, the publication of details concerning a secret mechanism whereby satellites were followed required its alteration at the expense of considerable time and money.

The newspapers which printed these stories were loyal, patriotic, responsible and well-meaning. Had we been engaged in open warfare, they undoubtedly would not have published such items. But in the absence of open warfare, they recognized only the tests of journalism and not the tests of national security. And my question tonight is whether additional tests should not now be adopted.

That question is for you alone to answer. No public official should answer it for you. No governmental plan should impose its restraints against your will. But I would be failing in my duty to the Nation, in considering all of the responsibilities that we now bear and all of the means at hand to meet those responsibilities, if I did not commend this problem to your attention, and urge its thoughtful consideration.

On many earlier occasions, I have said-and your newspapers have constantly said-that these are times that appeal to every citizen's sense of sacrifice and self-discipline. They call out to every citizen to weigh his rights and comforts against his obligations to the common good. I cannot now believe that those citizens who serve in the newspaper business consider themselves exempt from that appeal.

I have no intention of establishing a new Office of War Information to govern the flow of news. I am not suggesting any new forms of censorship or new types of security classifications. I have no easy answer to the dilemma that I have posed, and would not seek to impose it if I had one. But I am asking the members of the newspaper profession and the industry in this country to reexamine their own responsibilities, to consider the degree and the nature of the present danger, and to heed the duty of self-restraint which that danger imposes upon us all.

Every newspaper now asks itself, with respect to every story: "Is it news?" All I suggest is that you add the question: "Is it in the interest of the national security?" And I hope that every group in America-unions and businessmen and public officials at every level--will ask the same question of their endeavors, and subject their actions to this same exacting test.

And should the press of America consider and recommend the voluntary assumption of specific new steps or machinery, I can assure you that we will cooperate wholeheartedly with those recommendations.

Perhaps there will be no recommendations. Perhaps there is no answer to the dilemma faced by a free and open society in a cold and secret war. In times of peace, any discussion of this subject, and any action that results, are both painful and without precedent. But this is a time of peace and peril which knows no precedent in history.

It is the unprecedented nature of this challenge that also gives rise to your second obligation--an obligation which I share. And that is our obligation to inform and alert the American people--to make certain that they possess all the facts that they need, and understand them as well--the perils, the prospects, the purposes of our program and the

choices that we face.

No President should fear public scrutiny of his program. For from that scrutiny comes understanding; and from that understanding comes support or opposition. And both are necessary. I am not asking your newspapers to support an Administration, but I am asking your help in the tremendous task of informing and alerting the American people. For I have complete confidence in the response and dedication of our citizens whenever they are fully informed.

I not only could not stifle controversy among your readers--I welcome it. This Administration intends to be candid about its errors; for, as a wise man once said: "An error doesn't become a mistake until you refuse to correct it." We intend to accept full responsibility for our errors; and we expect you to point them out when we miss them.

Without debate, without criticism, no Administration and no country can succeed--and no republic can survive. That is why the Athenian law-maker Solon decreed it a crime for any citizen to shrink from controversy. And that is why our press was protected by the First Amendment--the only business in America specifically protected by the Constitution--not primarily to amuse and entertain, not to emphasize the trivial and the sentimental, not to simply "give the public what it wants"--but to inform, to arouse, to reflect, to state our dangers and our opportunities, to indicate our crises and our choices, to lead, mold, educate and sometimes even anger public opinion.

This means greater coverage and analysis of international news--for it is no longer far away and foreign but close at hand and local. It means greater attention to improved understanding of the news as well as improved transmission. And it means, finally, that government at all levels must meet its obligation to provide you with the fullest possible information outside the narrowest limits of national security--and we intend to do it.

It was early in the Seventeenth Century that Francis Bacon remarked on three recent inventions already transforming the world: the compass, gunpowder and the printing press. Now the links between the nations first forged by the compass have made us all citizens of the world, the hopes and threats of one becoming the hopes and threats of us all. In that one world's efforts to live together, the evolution of gunpowder to its ultimate limit has warned mankind of the terrible consequences of failure.

And so it is to the printing press--to the recorder of man's deeds, the keeper of his conscience, the courier of his news--that we look for strength and assistance, confident that with your help man will be what he was born to be: free and independent.

George: Welcome to the "World Review Commentary" this 25th day of November 2007 and we're broadcasting live from the Texas School Book Depository. This program is dedicated to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I'm sitting here and on my left is Charlotte Littlefield Brown. Charlotte, what did you think about that speech?

Charlotte: It was outstanding. It was quite applicable to today even though it's a very old speech.

George: Yes. That speech was given on April 27th, 1961 and it was so, God, so prophetic. Welcome to our program, Alan Watt.

Alan: It's a pleasure to be here. I can hear you fine.

George: We dedicated this. We're sitting at the spot here. We're sitting in the lobby of the Texas School Book Depository. We did a tour earlier of the grounds and so forth and Charlotte was down here last week. What did you think about that speech? I noticed you put this up, what, over a year ago in June of 2006? What did you say on your page back then?

Alan: I mentioned the fact that Kennedy basically knew. He mentions it in his talk of a conspiracy itself. A huge conspiracy and he mentioned the fact too that it was so well organized through economics, military and academia and the media that democratic nations could hardly stand against it, because democratic nations, really, that's the opponent of the particular group that runs the world, the reality as we know it. They run the media. They run the military. They're coordinated and they originated in Britain a long time ago and Professor Carroll Quigley called them the Anglo-American Establishment.

George: I believe Paul Dill Scott coined the term deep history. Is this the way you could characterize this also?

Alan: There's no doubt.

George: A history that is not written. What we're presented most of the time is just for our feedings, something like that? Is that your idea?

Alan: Here's a quote for instance from Professor Carroll Quigley who was a historian for one of the branches of this power and he believed in its goals but he was a bit weary of some of its methods, but he was the official historian. In Britain one of its main groups – there are many groups attached to it. It really originated hundreds of years ago in Britain but came to the fore in the last 1800's when the British aristocracy saw this odd phenomenon called democracy coming along and people were demanding rights. They came to the conclusion after many, many meetings of the largest aristocratic families in Europe that there were too many irreconcilable differences in humanity, with racial differences, religious, economic and so on, ever to allow a plan or an agenda of progress to continue.

Therefore they came up with the idea of shaping the world's view of things while this real group would go ahead in their plan of progress. This is what Carroll Quigley said about it on page 197 of "***The Anglo-American Establishment***." Remember, he worked for one of the American branches called The Council on Foreign Relations, which is just the foreign branch of the Royal Institute for International Affairs for Britain.

He says:

"A brief sketch of the Royal Institute for International Affairs does not by any means indicate the very considerable influence which the organization exerts in English-speaking countries in the sphere in which it is devoted. The extent of that influence must be obvious. The purpose of this chapter has been something else: to show that the Milner Group..."

Alan: This is part of the group that started it.

"...controls the Institute. Once that is established, the picture changes. The influence of Chatham House..."

Alan: That's their main house in London. The one in New York is called Harold Pratt Building.

"...appears in its true perspective, not as the influence of an autonomous body but as merely one of the many instruments in the arsenal of another power."

Alan: That's what he telling you there. There's an arsenal of another power. It's a power which co-exists alongside what you see as democracy. He says:

"When the influence which the Institute wields is combined with that controlled by the Milner Group in other fields in education..."

Alan: You see they run the educational system.

"...in administration..."

Alan: That's in politics and bureaucracy.

"...in newspapers and periodicals..."

Alan: They make sure the largest newspaper groups are owned by their members. He said:

"...a really terrifying picture begins to emerge. This picture is called terrifying not because the power of the Milner Group was used for evil ends. It was not. On the contrary, it was generally used with the best intentions in the world - even if those intentions were so idealistic as to be almost academic. The picture is terrifying because such power, whatever the goals at which it may be directed, is too much to be entrusted safely to any group."

Alan: Then he goes on to tell you why. This particular group in the book here he comes out with their histories and he was given access to their records and he tells you how they were behind the main world wars that we knew of, even before world wars, they started up the Boer War in South Africa. They are backed by the Royalty of Europe. They have been given an official royal charter and they'll say their idea was to combat and control in fact what we see as democracy or democratic governments and they've been doing it since the 1800's.

Charlotte: Alan, what do you think they thought of our President John Fitzgerald Kennedy?

Alan: It's pretty obvious he was torn between two different ideals. He himself came from a family that made money like many of them did in certain rackets like many of the British imperialists did it top, involved in the various opium trades and eventually the alcohol trades and the prohibition.

George: We've got to cut away here for a second. We'll be right back. Let's take a

quick break. We'll be right back. Welcome back to World Review Commentary. This is George Butler reporting live from Dallas, Texas along with--

Charlotte: Charlotte Littlefield Brown.

George: Alan, let me give you more of a formal introduction here: In all ages, in all lands, there have been those who seek truth. This seeking is an individual's search for something more than self, and much more than the confines of this worldly system. It is the seeker, who understands there is more than what meets the eye, who is not afraid and makes the choice to go into the unknown. The process of awaking has begun, the discovery is underway. Written 2007 by Alan Watt. Welcome back to World Review Commentary, Alan.

Alan: It's a pleasure to be here.

George: We're really sitting here in a very historical place and I think the actual assassination anniversary would have been last Thursday, but the nearest that we could come in here would be today on Sunday on the World Review Commentary program and so we went out and toured the grounds earlier. The snipers, wherever they were, behind the picket fence or something, it wasn't 75 feet away. They were very, very close in shots and from the top of the building here the snipers nest was maybe 100 feet, 125 feet at the most. When we talk about these world systems, Kennedy had something to say about that in that speech. Anyway, I think Charlotte wanted to continue with her question earlier.

Charlotte: Alan, you were answering a question before the break about what the establishment, I'm going to call them the Anglo-American Establishment, possibly what their view was of our president?

Alan: He was not as they call it in Freemasonry "toeing the line". He was not "toeing the line." He had twinges of something which you cannot have if you're a member of the elite, and that's conscience; and he thought that the people should know and have more say in their own affairs. I mean at that level that he was in especially since his father was Joseph and Joseph was a close associate with royalty. He used to go over to Buckingham Palace with his wife and live there for weeks at a time, so he knew the agenda. I have no doubt about it, but he had a twinge of conscience being the son of Joseph and he tried to tell the people where it was heading. He saw the flaws in the agenda too, because from the elites' point of view they're not flaws.

They want a world system and this is the same group that funded Karl Marx in the 1800's from London, England. That's where he wrote the Communist Manifesto where he said later on in "**Das Kapital**" there will be three world trading blocs. A United Europe followed by a United Americas and then a Pacific Rim conglomerate which will be presided over by a single government and that's what the United Nations was set-up for. Carroll Quigley again verifies this in his books "**Tragedy & Hope**" and "**The Anglo-American Establishment**". He said that they funded and set-up the League of Nations, which became the United Nations, to do that actual thing, so they're all fronts actually including the United Nations. They're front groups for different purpose: a controlled society of a very wealthy elite of aristocracy who truly believe they are the most superior types on the planet through breeding, selective breeding and so on, accumulation of power,

wealth, and that below them they have the commoners, the junk genes, as they laughingly call it, and they want to plan a future. They don't believe in societies simply evolving willy-nilly and piece meal. They plan the future like long-term business plans.

As I say, all the way back to the 1800's you can find these organizations all coming out with royal charters and stamp of approval of the Crown of Britain behind them and to go even further, this group created what we call MI5 and 6. MI6 evolved really out of like the CIA evolved out of the OSS during World War II. The headquarters of this OSS was at Chatham House. That was the headquarters, so, in other words, the Royal Institute for International Affairs already was your world's largest CIA headquarters and it still is today. They're all intertwined with this one organization and so is the CIA and your media barons all belong to it at the top as well. They're all members of this and that's what Carroll Quigley was saying. We are given a fake reality through altered and distorted or very misleading news, and we have been for 100 years.

George: So this system is much larger than the average person could ever imagine and it's entangling us. It's psychological. It's mind washing. It's propagandizing. I guess Joseph Goebbels said the bigger the lie the easier to sell.

Alan: Yes, absolutely. The thing is these little people, ordinary people understand little lies and we laugh when we hear politicians give little lies out, but when they tell a real whopper of a lie it's so huge telling it to a whole world we can't imagine ourselves doing it, therefore we have to believe it. It's as simple as that.

George: Would you say 9/11 is one of those myths that has been created? The government version of it? It's so mind boggling that emotionally it's hard to accept.

Alan: Absolutely and yet they use the standard psychological techniques from Rumsfeld, Cheney, even Brzezinski came out. Eventually they had Condoleezza Rice when she came out and they all came out of these meetings talking to the press and using the same catch phrases; weapons of mass destruction. Repetitive stuff that they're taught to tell the public and they lied and they lied and they lied and they lied and then they were exposed lying and with counterintelligence news on mainstream as well and the following day the same characters are telling the same lies again. These are psychopathic types you see. They have no conscience and they don't blush when they lie to the world. They don't blush.

Charlotte: Could that be a part of the gene pool? No, I'm just kidding.

Alan: It probably is, yes.

Charlotte: Why does that particular trait seem to be so pervasive? And of course they screen people that they bring in from the damage - what did you call it? They call us--

George: The damaged genes.

Charlotte: The damaged genes or whatever, so they screen people through and if

they meet a certain psychological profile then they'll be allowed to work or move in towards the center. Of course, nobody off the street ever gets in there.

George: Michael Andregg on his book "*On the Causes of War*" identified a psychopathic personality type that is attracted into these power groups. What do you think?

Alan: There's no doubt at all. Unfortunately the entire system we live in – you see psychopaths or pathocracy as it's been termed have always been here in a monied system because they crave power and money is power in this system, because the culture they give us and the system we live in is actually theirs. We emulate their system. We don't have all the psychopathic traits, but those even in the lower strata who are born occasionally with psychopathic traits will succeed. They'll claw up to the top. They're vicious, ruthless and cunning and they have no conscience, and therefore they do get to the top in this system. That's why they always gravitate into politics and political positions. They like the feelings of power. It's a craving that goes with being a psychopath because a psychopath who wants to control; they need to control to feel safe.

George: Is another characteristic they have no conscience whatsoever?

Alan: They have no conscience that's true. No empathy. They grow up almost like a camera studying people and watching the reactions and the emotions but not feeling the emotions of those people, but they're very good actors. In fact a lot of them go into acting.

George: They do. Some of our finest actors could be this way, right?

Alan: That's right.

Charlotte: At the time of John F. Kennedy's assassination there were a lot of things happening that people point to why he was assassinated. What were the forces during that time period in John F. Kennedy's administration that people point to and say that's why he got assassinated or this is who did it? For example, it's my understanding he was going after the deconstruction of the Federal Reserve System. I mean I don't know how true that was.

Alan: That would get anybody killed. That would get anybody killed, that one, because that was part of the whole structure too. People think it was just a group of bankers that got together on Jekyll Island under the leadership too of Mandell House that eventually was the advisor to President Wilson that rammed it through and all that was true, but what they don't tell you is that Mandell House was a member of this same organization based in London and he took his orders from Sir Earl Grey that was a member of The Royal Institute for International Affairs. It always, always goes back to the same group, whether it's the U.S. or any of the British Commonwealth countries we're talking about. It always goes back to the same group. They wanted control over the world's resources and the money supply of the entire planet.

George: We've got to cut away again, Alan. We'll be back in just a few minutes. It's getting very interesting though. Welcome back to World Review Commentary.

This is your host George Butler along with--

Charlotte: Charlotte Littlefield Brown.

George: Welcome back, Alan Watt.

Alan: It's a pleasure to hear you.

George: This system that we're describing and you so well describe, it was arrayed against him, was it not, against John Fitzgerald Kennedy these great powers and interest?

Alan: Absolutely. I mean he was called the Champion of Camelot, remember.

George: That's right. The Champion of Camelot.

Alan: He was idealistic and being idealistic and wanting to actually make changes and lead it yourself is taboo in this system where it's all done by consensus through this particular high organization. That was an unfortunate term they used. It was almost a death warrant in itself because we know what happened to King Arthur.

George: What I see from my side of things is that these groups that were together, whether they're the mafia and the CFR, whatever, they started working together more closely after World War II or during World War II sometime.

Alan: It's true. They worked very close then, especially in Italy. Patton could not have gone through so quickly without the cooperation of the mafia units in that country.

George: In Sicily they sabotaged the Germans in Sicily I understand also. So I believe – here's my proposition. It's just sort of an idea. Was President Kennedy not fully aware of the full cooperation of these different interests that had arrayed against him?

Alan: Absolutely he was. There's no doubt about it. He was well aware of how it was completely interlocked.

George: Did he understand the power that they had together and did he understand the close cooperation or was he sort of a little bit too idealistic?

Alan: He understood the cooperation. Maybe he underestimated how ruthless they'd be even with himself. I don't know.

George: That's what I'm saying. Maybe the ruthlessness he underestimated.

Alan: It's very possible. Very, very possible or he could have probably have trusted all his bodyguards very, very well. A big mistake to make actually, but I'm sure he must of, and we know that day so many of the things just didn't make sense. It's much like 9/11. On 9/11 they were having a practice drill on planes hitting the tower. What a coincidence, just like with the bombs in London they

were having practices with bombs going off exactly in those locations they went off. When Kennedy was assassinated all of the Air Force that was up, remember, in the Cold War supposedly with all their failsafe books and so on, their manuals, updated everyday; that was the one day that there was an exception. They were not given any books whatsoever, so they could not have attacked anything if someone had come in after Kennedy was killed and taken off and done something crazy.

George: So they didn't want a reaction, a nuclear reaction by the United States against anyone that was suspected of maybe the assassination.

Alan: In case someone lower down in the chain of command gave the orders, they couldn't have gone anywhere anyway because they had nothing to follow, so someone at the very top had taken care of that.

George: Colonel Fletcher Prouty was down in the Antarctic during that time.

Charlotte: At the time of Kennedy's assassination we have - he's wanting to close down and dismantle the CIA. He dismissed Allen Dulles, right? He had failed in Cuba. He was stepping on the oil interests. Of course, he was going up against the Mafioso. He was jailing the mafia.

George: Jimmy Hoffa was jailed.

Charlotte: And he was publicly speaking out against the secret societies. I mean that is - if you want to cause a synergy.

Alan: Exactly, because these things are all interconnected. Remember, the mafia itself is only an arm - actually it's an organizational arm of the same group at the top because they use the underworld, the legal system, and they use the illegal system. The mafia was set-up by Giuseppe Mazzini who was set-up to start the World Revolutionary Society on behalf of Britain and Albert Pike gave him the orders to take over the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry. He was the head of it after Pike for a while. These are all authorized groups coming out of the same system under the guise of noble orders from Britain.

Charlotte: Is that when people say the tentacles of the octopus; is that kind of what they're referring to? Each one of these is an arm? Anyways, I've heard that.

Alan: Absolutely. In fact as I say when you go into the Cecil Rhodes Will who was given again a Royal Charter and massive funding to make sure that the Rhodes Scholarship went on and some of your presidents have been Rhodes Scholars. You have about 200 high bureaucrats running your top departments who are all coming from Rhodes Scholarships and they were set-up for world government. That's what they swear allegiance to, world government, and they've been doing this in all the countries now for 100 years, so they run that system. They take over the resources of the world. That was another big, big mandate that they had. They set-up huge institutes, private institutions that you think are charitable like the Rockefeller Foundation all leading towards world government and giving out World Citizenship awards. They're after the wealth of the world. They run the military might of the world. They run the educational system of the world through

UNESCO and through the national and international educational associations. They run the media of the world. They also, as Carroll Quigley said in his own book, they write the histories of the world, so they give you your whole reality.

George: But not the deep history, right? They write the shadow histories but not the deep ones, right?

Alan: Yes.

Charlotte: That's very powerful. This building I would like to encourage everybody if they are in Dallas to come down and they call it the sixth floor museum.

George: It's at 311 Elm Street.

Charlotte: It's right across the road between where the plaza is and George and I walked into it this morning and it's a very - in military terms it was a perfect ambush location. There were, I would say, at least five different angles to get in on the vehicle and the distance was very short and of course early in the morning there were already people down on the grounds selling magazines, selling newspapers.

George: We met one fellow that was actually here that day.

Charlotte: They have the COPA conference going on across the road.

George: The COPA is the Coalition On Political Assassinations. That's meeting here in Dallas this weekend.

Charlotte: And so one of the gentlemen that was attending the conference had come over and I suppose he was just looking at the site; he's from out of town, up north somewhere. It's a historical place. This is a non-profit organization. Right now they do not take any government grants. They do not have donations. Basically, the museum continues to go based on the admissions so it's an independent entity and I for one am very grateful that they stepped forward to restore this part of our history or to maintain it. Up on the sixth floor is a very interesting exhibit. Of course you pay your money and you get a set of headphones and you go up and they walk you through a very elaborate presentation and you get to - part of the presentation is you actually look out the sixth floor window and then they also at the very end they present to you just about seven or eight conspiracy theories.

George: So they are beginning to open up I think to several different possible situations that did occur here.

Charlotte: No conclusions can be drawn from the museum as far as that goes and then there was a display about the John Birch Society and then a gentlemen by the name of Edwin Walker. I guess he was an army officer that was disciplined for passing out John Birch Society. So it's very historical the things that were happening in the newspapers. It's all there on display. It's very interesting and I encourage everybody to come down and see this part of our history. So there's my

plug for the museum.

Alan: Did you go around to the courthouse?

George: No, we didn't make it over there yet, but it's real close by.

Alan: It's interesting. You stand opposite it and look at the dragons on top of the courthouse. Then look to your left there. Look to the left and you'll see a pyramid; the top of the building is a big pyramid to the left. Then look at the triad, the three roads, the trident that goes into Dealey Plaza with the bridge over it. The arc always goes over the trident in the mystery religions.

George: Would this also represent an occultic type of terms killing of the king?

Alan: Yes. Killing of the king, in fact, if you go into the history of Dealey Plaza and you'll get quite the history on the land that those three roads were built over. A lot of people died there before, so it was already ritualized you might say. However, the Killing of the King was always when – even in the high mystery religions when you take the oath in the very high ones you say that your skull will be opened and the light of the sun will be on your brain; and they literally opened up his skull as he was driving into the sun.

Charlotte: It's fascinating and these types of things could be prepared decades years in advance. This is our little execution alley. Give them a dally.

George: So the killing of the king would relate back in my understanding is if a king fails to bring good crops in or rain or something, this is more of the ancient primitive idea, then they kill the king and put in a new king in.

Alan: It's also called Saturn, the Saturnalia. Sometimes they had “King for a Day,” they called it, or a term, and a person who had all the benefits of a king and during that reign he was called “the author of misrule” because he would be doing whatever he wanted to do. Kennedy really thought he was president for a while and he was doing what he wanted to do, and then of course they kill him on the appointed time.

George: So this would be in this case if he was out of favor then killing of the king was commenced. Something like that. We're going to be leaving here for a few minutes. We have but a one minute break at the top of the hour and we'll bring you right back in and this is getting – this occult connection is very, very interesting and we'll talk a little bit more about that when we return. Thank you, Alan.

HOOR 2:

George: Welcome back to World Review Commentary. This is your host George Butler along with...

Charlotte: Charlotte Littlefield-Brown and I'd like to invite the listening audience to visit our websites. We have We the People Radio Network, which is WTPRN.com. Our guest, Alan Watt, his website is

cuttingthroughthematrix.com and of course our website is the secrettruth.com and that's for the benefit of people who are driving and maybe they want to go home and get on the computer...

George: We also have World Review.tv that we're broadcasting on right today. Charlotte and I--

Charlotte: Oh, yes, I did that wrong.

George: We have a couple of programs. We have the secrettruth.com and worldreview.tv.

Charlotte: And they're blending together on there, sorry.

George: Welcome back, Alan Watt, to the program.

Alan: It's a pleasure.

George: This occultic system of rule is very powerful, is it not?

Alan: Incredibly powerful when you look at it - you see, people are so detached now from even recent history. They don't get much recent history. In fact, their children are taught now that history is irrelevant and that's intentional, and yet if you don't know your history you don't know what's going on today because the past controls the future, as George Orwell said. The feudal system that ran us for a thousand years in Europe never left us. It never left us and it was all based on better blood, special breeding and selection of mates to have this special blood, this special gene, and they called them "bluebloods" of course. It goes all the way up to royalty, the best of all, supposedly, and they have orders within there, knightly orders and Knights of the Garter and so on. These orders at the bottom are for good works towards the Great Work as they call it. The Great Work is the foundation of a new governmental system - a system for the entire planet, run by those who deem themselves the fittest to rule over the people.

That's what it's all based on and Cecil Rhodes when he set-up the main organization to start where all the rest of them came from. They all belonged to the main organization, the Rhodes Foundation. He said, "*We shall base this on a secret society similar to the Jesuits,*" and they have, and they also give out awards just like the Jesuits do with higher orders to those who play the game. You'll notice that many of your presidents after they left the presidency went over and got knighted by the Queen. Kissinger even went over and got knighted by the Queen. Giuliani in New York went over and got knighted by the Queen. It seems to be a very, very important thing for them to be knighted by the Queen and the higher up the orders in the knighthood they become, eventually they're eligible to intermarry into that "better stock" as they call it. They're given the right to do so.

George: Alan Greenspan when he retired went over there and took a job at Her Majesty's treasury.

Alan: We're already international. Really the U.S. and Britain have been joined at the hip - Carroll Quigley said that this, he called it "the parallel government." He

said, "*this parallel government has existed for 50-odd years.*" That was back in the '60's he said that. We've got 100 years of it. It's already there and really politics is just a sideshow for the public because he said that every president who's picked in the United States from either party, including their advisers, are always members of the same Council on Foreign Relations.

George: Today one of those subgroups is out of Chicago as I understand. The Chicago Foreign Relations I think.

Alan: Yes, and they have the Roundtable Societies and many other groups are all in a pyramid type structure all belong to it and give allegiance to it.

George: I think Barack Obama's wife is the director of that subgroup up there in Chicago, Michelle. So they tie them in. How do you see this presidential race shaping up? Some people have told me and the rumors are that Hillary has been sort of picked to go into the White House.

Alan: I've no doubt that she's been groomed whenever she does get in, but they're always groomed. They're groomed long before the public ever hear their names in fact, many years, many years before; and again that's backed up by Carroll Quigley and others. These people are vetted. They never allow someone who is not vetted and is not part of this same organization, this structure that Kennedy was talking about there and Quigley was talking about. They never let an outsider get in. They just can't get in.

George: Even Kennedy attended as a young man the London School of Economics.

Alan: That's right and that's only of the same group because the Oxford that runs the Rhode Scholarship also runs the London School of Economics.

George: You know what they always leave out, Alan? London School of Economics and Political Science. And political science. They always leave that out for some reason. I don't know. Do they purposely leave that out or do they just shorten the name of it?

Alan: They just shorten the name. You tend to find that the ones that come out of the Rhodes Scholarships end up as presidents and high bureaucrats in charge of State Departments especially and foreign offices and your intelligence services. The ones who are sent to the London School of Economics they can still end up as presidents but their role mainly is to push the socialization of society by incurring more debt. They play the left wing. That's their job. They play both sides, the dialectic, but they both belong to Oxford University.

Charlotte: Not to divert the conversation too far off, but what about Jacqueline Kennedy and her son and why did he have to die? You know the peripheral people associated with John F. Kennedy. What about Jacqueline?

Alan: Jacqueline is an interesting person because you see in the high religions too and remember old Joseph had worked his way up through nefarious means himself to get to a position just like the pirates used to do. When you take Yale University

and most of the big guys there belong to this British society at the time, too, set up by Elihu Yale in the U.S. He goes back a long, long ways. They made their money in the opium wars, including Kerry and the Bush's family, against China; while the Kennedy's made their money through prohibition and smuggling cocaine and alcohol in with the Bronfman's from Canada into the U.S. Then when Canada put in prohibition and the U.S. stopped it they simply reversed the flow. They used Cuba as their main base, so Cuba was always very important to them for drugs and booze and they actually ran ocean liners to smuggle all this stuff in, so he done great work old Joseph.

As I say, he was always over to see the Royal Family and stay with them, so he was given permission to intermarry into higher genetic stock. Jacqueline Kennedy is very interesting because Benjamin Franklin when he joined the Hellfire Club in England, a higher Masonic group that also went under the name of the Order of Misrule because they had orgies and so on, they had a particular type of brothel attached to them. Not ordinary prostitutes, these women were from selected families and the honor was given to an occasional person who set up the Great Work. They could mate with them for the offspring and the one he mentioned that was the head of that particular house attached to the Hellfire Club was Madame Bouvier, and that's the great, great, great-grandmother of Jacqueline Kennedy, so she came from that stock, the high breeding stock.

Charlotte: I'm speechless.

George: Boy, I'll tell you that is something. Alan, how long have you studied this world system, how long have you been at this really studying it in detail?

Alan: Since I was born.

George: You said once that when you were just an infant you started looking around and noticing that the way it worked, right? The way it really worked? Is that sort of a way you sort of got onto some of these systems?

Alan: I did. I saw. I knew intuitively. I saw people arguing and fighting for basic necessities in a country that supposedly had gone through not just world wars but perpetual wars for about 200 years, all for the sake of the Bank of England and debt and so on, and I wondered why so many people were simply poor. They plundered the planet, which they had, how come the majority of the public in England and Scotland, Ireland or Wales were basically poor but you had this incredibly wealthy elite living in and around London, very old families? I realized then very young that the system was totally controlled right down through economics. They knew just how much to pay the working families to keep them in poverty and never get ahead and how to use them in warfare. I studied that in detail and when I got access to – and I was given access to adult libraries at a very early age and I went into the old libraries. I used to walk four or five miles sometimes on weekends to get into them when I was about six and seven and read books that had been printed in the 1700's in reference parts of libraries that told you the histories as they happened at the time. I compared it to what I was being taught at school at my time and they were completely different histories. Completely different histories.

The schools already had their histories completely altered to suit the times and

later on when I read George Orwell's "**1984**," the main character was Winston whose job it was working for this big bureaucracy, his job was to eradicate certain parts of history and alter it, and I realized they've always been doing this. They've always been doing it and again Professor Carroll Quigley backs that up in his own book because he takes the records of the Council on Foreign Relations from their records department, he was the historian for them, and fills in all the blank parts of history that you're not told in your regular books. You see most of the mainstream authors that you had for 50-odd years have been authorized to write what they write. They're told what to write and another book has come out recently with declassified documentation stating that very thing, from your poets to your artists to your authors, the main characters that you had for 50-odd years were run by the CIA.

Charlotte: Right, and additionally the people aren't just told what to do. They're given money. They're given an easy life. Things all of a sudden become easy.

George: A comfort zone, right?

Charlotte: Right, exactly. So it's persuasion. It's threats. It's bribery. It's these types of antics. Not a genuine desire to serve or however you want to frame it. They're bribed.

George: Most people though are in sort of a delusional state and they're not fully awake and aware of the way it really works.

Alan: They don't know. I'll give you a little story of how it really works because a man phoned me up. He was an author and a registered author. He'd written other books before. Now most folk think that you as a little writer send off your stuff to the publishers and they review it and say yes or no and then maybe they'll back you and give you some funding and publish the book. It doesn't work that way. This guy was phoned by Penguin Books who told him to write the Dummy's book on Revelations, like these Dummy's books for this and so on.

George: I have a whole collection of those.

Alan: They told him the format and the whole thing and he asked me if I'd bring him on my program and give him an expose, and so I said I don't want to fool people at all. I know exactly where you'll go with this book, predictive programming, and at the end he tried and tried and says eventually I'll tell you - he was desperate to get me to do this. He says I believe in helping widows and orphans; and I said I don't care, I'm not a Mason. That was a plea for help. That's what happened. Penguin phoned him to write the book on it.

George: Penguin is tied to the Financial Times of London and all that, right? That's who owns the Penguin print house.

Alan: I was phoned, too, on more than one occasion by big powers, big powers.

George: You know who published Greenspan's book? Penguin did.

Alan: I was offered, too, if I would just go along with this alien agenda that's very

important to confuse the public, they'd publish all by books on it and so on and I'd be riding high and I said no.

George: Well you have integrity Alan. That's it.

Alan: I also got a threat after that from a big publisher who said he'd phone radio stations and tell them not to have me on anymore.

George: They can phone me all day. I'll have you on any time if you want to be on my show, on our program.

Charlotte: Gentlemen, I have something. In John F. Kennedy's speech, the one we just played, "The President and the Press," he talked about a lot of things but one of the things that he talked about it was important that we talk about the international news; and of course we know that we don't communicate. The public of Canada doesn't directly communicate with the public of America or Mexico or Paraguay or pick your country. What type of - is there any informal communication between these countries that's not regulated that you are aware? I can't think of any.

Alan: You mean press wise?

Charlotte: Right.

Alan: No. Everything is controlled. All the big newspapers are all controlled again and authorized to be there and even Quigley mentions all the papers. He mentions the top characters who own them and what allegiance they have to which societies.

Charlotte: So we can't communicate as a people? No state, no nation, none of that, but just people to people. We're very isolated in that sense. We're kept in our little boxes.

Alan: Yes, intentionally so.

George: The internet, that's a big, big source of communicating today.

Alan: It's a source but again even Brzezinski talked about that long before we heard of the computer. He said eventually a form of communication would be given to the public which they will think is to help them communicate to each other but in fact will actually develop a new world culture. It will be controlled in other words, because the biggest sites out there are in to the young and it's to tantalize and fascinate them and also to put ideas in their heads towards this new system that's coming in.

George: It's like the semantic web. It's another level of control and creating ideas and invoking them. We've got to cut away here for a second. We'll be right back, Alan. Welcome back to World Review Commentary. This is your host George Butler along with...

Charlotte: Charlotte Littlefield Brown.

George: Welcome back, Alan Watt.

Alan: It's a pleasure to talk to you.

George: I think Charlotte was trying to make a point, maybe like email or something on the web. Hasn't that opened up the world a little bit more than before as far as – we know that the internet can be used for good and for bad purposes but would email be – like what is the kind of feedback you're getting on your sites today? Are you getting some positive feedback in trying to progress this thing towards more truth or what?

Alan: Yes, especially from those with more of an open mind. They don't just jump in and pick sides and all this kind of thing. They don't go into chatrooms and just argue. That's very disturbing when people get into these things. They follow them like football teams.

George: They really want to take sides.

Alan: Yes and that's intentional. They understand humanity very well. However, what I'm getting is a lot of positive feedback from young people who are open and they're standing back and watching and learning and asking the right questions because they're going to live through the brunt of these changes, the big changes that are coming upon us right now as we go into this global system with the scientific dictatorship styles. See, part of this big institution that runs the world also uses the sciences to the limit and they decided long ago when they put out people like Huxley and others and Galton Darwin that they would create a new type of peasantry. A more improved peasantry of the world and actually genetically alter them to be better workers. We see the rush through genetics. That's why the incredible funding since the early 1900's towards genetics has gone on; it's to fulfill this agenda because to the elite WE, the ordinary people now are obsolete. The old system is gone. We're post-industrial. We're post-agricultural. We're post-industrial and really post-technological. All the technology now is in China. They don't need the people in the West so they're going to drastically reduce the populations. It's all through their literature that they put out themselves.

In fact the Royal Institute for International Affairs if you look into their websites you'll see where they've had international meetings on the control of all foodstuffs in the world and you wouldn't believe that every facet of your life: political, economic, social, career wise is all controlled. The future is being controlled by the decisions of these organizations within the Royal Institute for International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations. They run the whole system and they have unlimited financing to do so and they publish a lot their findings in their own magazine, the Foreign Affairs Magazine they put out every month.

Charlotte: The one thing that's always got me is unlimited financing. It's like when you create the money out of thin air.

Alan: It's quite simple, absolutely.

George: You have a document on your site, the UK Department of Defence document. If you go into cuttingthroughthematrix.com on Alan Watt's site, you'll find a document there you can download and read and what it is it predicts the future. They're trying to predict the future about different aspects of the world system, the problems?

Alan: Yes they know and this is from the Department of Defence for Britain which is also the head of NATO and we're part of NATO charters and so is the U.S. What they've come up with is gradually escalating riots amongst the general public across the western world for the next 30 years. They don't tell you why there'll be riots, but, of course, if you read their plans you'll understand it. The whole way of life that we're so used to, families – the families have been under attack for a long time. They declared it obsolete back in the 1920's, they'd have to destroy the family unit, so you had a war on families. They also talked about a new scientifically controlled future where you wouldn't get born unless there was a job for you to fulfill. In other words they needed you. They talked about killing off the inferior types that were mentally below par because eugenics – they run the eugenics societies, which are now called “bioethics committees” by the way. That's the same Eugenics Society run by Rockefeller Foundation.

George: Sounds a lot better, bioethics, doesn't it?

Alan: It's much more fuzzy and warm.

George: It makes me feel so good, and it's 40 degrees outside up here in Dallas today.

Alan: The world they're going to bring in and we're going into it now is to be one where our brains, our minds will be controlled electronically and they've had world meetings about this at Loyola University in Louisiana where they say they have a brain chip ready to go for implant. All they have to do now is convince the public of the necessity to take it and Newt Gingrich, by the way, is the head, the spokesman. He's in overall charge of this particular project. They never retire these men and the head man from Japan the professor he said think of the society that's coming up more like the beehive. He says it will be impossible for an individual to even understand that they are an individual. They will be unable to perceive that and you'll hear this hum all day long through your head as the computers send signals to all those around you and to you and back and forth and so on. This is the new society they want to bring in and they're ushering it in mainly through science fiction to the young. Even their cartoon characters have chips in them that give them special power. They're talking about a virtual reality. Not a real reality, but an almost reality and it really goes into this matrix type scenario that you saw in the movie called "The Matrix." That's what they want to bring in: a controlled society where everyone is completely predictable – predictable because they will be programming you.

George: So they don't want anyone to overcome that system right?

Alan: Absolutely. This isn't speculation. It's not speculation. We've been under attack physically and psychologically through different means since they first gave us inoculations. When you go back into the histories of inoculations and I went

early on when I realized something was fantastically wrong with the side effects of inoculations and then I found people like Mr. Salk who gave us the polio vaccine. Up until then, this man had been one of the strongest advocates for the reduction of population by any means possible for the American Eugenics Society run by the Rockefeller Foundation. Then suddenly he's coming out with something to help you. Something's wrong with that picture and since those inoculations people have been dropping dead like crazy by cancers escalating.

Nothing happens in nature in a short period of time, and 40, 50 years is nothing, and yet you see the biophysical effects on people. You see them coming down with early arthritis, cancers. You see the men losing the sperm count. It's gone down 75 percent of the person pre-1950, so the men today are three-quarters sterile. The females have all the problems with their ovaries and so on, and you can even see it in the physical and biochemical changes in the structure of the physical body. The men are losing their shoulders. The women are losing their hips. That does not happen in nature in 50 years unless something has caused it to happen.

Then you go into the writings of Charles Galton Darwin in his book in the 1950's. It's called "***The Next Million Years***," where he talks about the need to do this to the general public to stop them breeding and sterilize them. He says we'll introduce hormonal changes into their body, either through their food, through inoculations or spraying from the air or putting it in the water.

Charlotte: But aren't these people being subjected to the same things?

Alan: No.

Charlotte: Are they living underground right now?

Alan: This is the interesting part about it, because, for instance, the aristocracies of Europe ran on a feudal system and they still do and Prince Charles alone has about I don't know how many hundreds of tenant farmers, hereditary tenant farmers who still work lands that he owns and all these people do too. They all have their own. They don't eat the same food that you get. They don't have cattle that are inoculated with all kinds of things. They don't have modified corn or wheat or anything else. They have the natural stuff and so they themselves will be unaffected by it.

George: We'll have to take another break real quick here and we'll be right back, Alan. Thank you. Welcome back to World Review Commentary. I'm George Butler along with...

Charlotte: Charlotte Littlefield Brown.

George: Welcome back, Alan Watt.

Alan: It's a pleasure to talk with you.

George: On the positive side of things what can we do? We can do broadcasts. We can do publications like you're doing. What other types of interaction with individuals can we do to try to further along the positive side of this world system?

Alan: It relies mainly on exposure of how it's being done, how it's happened. That's really the main factor because you see what we take for granted and children growing up take their culture for granted and everything in it. They take the internet for granted and the iPods and all the rest of it for granted. They're getting geared towards the chip and most of them will want it. We've got to show them how this is all planned, not to help them but actually control them. We have to also regain something that's been under attack for a long, long time in this cultural system. We've got to retain or get some values that will help us survive, because the values we've been given for the last 50 years are very debasing. It's intentional.

We've looked at worst side of human nature. That's been promulgated on television series after series until we mimic what we see, as Plato said, the public always do and he understood culture creation. We've got to start getting some proper values back. If we don't we're doomed because it's right down to the individual now. This is a battle really and not for the minds of the masses. It's for the minds of the 20 percent or under 20 percent, maybe 15 percent who are conscious of what's happening and have an ability to put that out to the public. The public always follow what they perceive as winners. They don't really care and that's a fact in all ages.

It's always the minority who thwart the most evil plans or divert it at least to give us breathing space to recoup, because we have been under attack our whole lives long and we never knew it. We never knew it. We never knew that the psychological machinery of propaganda was so advanced and coming across the airwaves at such a pace simply to make us misunderstand reality, to give us false perceptions of reality and to make us happy to go along with any agenda that we heard about as long as the government had given backing to it. We've got to stop that and regain our individuality. That's of prime importance because the society that's being created and they've said this at the top meetings in the world, the main enemy is individuality. An individual is more frightening to them than the masses. The masses they know will never come to a conclusion by themselves, they adopt opinions given by experts, but it's the individuals that scares them, especially individuals with knowledge who can put it across to others in a way which is understandable to them, giving them the right kind of evidence and proof and then leaving them with choices because this is a time for choice.

Everyone today living through this particular era has the choice to care about what's happening across the world and in their own lives and in those around them, or not to. An egosyntonic society has been purposely created. People are hedonistic. They care about themselves and no one else and they live in their little box isolated from other people. Many of them enjoy communicating through the internet, but this is an ethereal fake facsimile of interacting with real people. You're not really interacting with real people. You're almost in an imaginary world, a world where the people are missing from the voice. It's a voice in the airwaves that basically you're hearing. That's to further dissociate you with real interaction with real people, and that's been fostered and it's taken off very well with a lot of people who are addicted to internet and chatrooms and so on. They're losing contact or interaction with real people in society, even those around them.

George: Is there an inducement somewhat of a disassociative type of disorder in

a way? In other words, to break up that personality.

Alan: This was well understood back in the '50's and '60's. Professor Marshall McLuhan was one of the top men in this particular field where he talked about this coming age where we shall be contacting people. They're really voices. He said voices in the ether, bodiless voices all contacting each other in a surrealistic setting and how this could be abused by those who understand the control of the public's minds and they could actually use that to control the public even more so than they had it in his day. Because of his investigations into these particular methods of behavior control and modification, the CIA were tremendously interested in his work and that's at the same time as they were doing the MKULTRA experiments and all the rest of it, so the CIA were heavily involved in anything which would control the minds of the public.

Brzezinski further followed that up in his book **"Between Two Ages"** and one chapter he called **"The Technetronic Era."** He says where a type, a system will be able to influence the minds of millions of people and they will be completely unaware of the fact that their thoughts are not their own. A perfect form of mind control which they'd never suspect was even happening, and he was talking about scalar wave energy and so on, the HAARP type technologies, and that's all being used on the public today. We are under attack and we have been our whole lives long.

Charlotte: Yes. These days whenever I don't feel well or I'm in a bad mood or I have no energy that's what comes into my mind: Is it me or is it a wave hitting me? And a lot of times it seems like everybody has a down day together and it's really kind of - and then there are times when it's just me or whatever, but that's always a concern.

Alan: What I've noticed too, because I get so many phone calls coming in from all over the U.S. and Canada when the spraying is heavy in the skies and you pick up the HAARP frequencies on the shortwave radio where you hear it pounding away there 24 hours a day. I see the moods in the people and they'll tell me they feel either tired or irritable and so you can actually do your own little informal surveys and you did find this. It's happening on a mass scale. The same type of mood at the same time and that's not coincidence. Remember that's written into the Weather Warfare Treaty at the United Nations that was signed in the 1970's. That's the easiest thing to induce amongst the public is either tiredness or mood changes with that scalar technology.

Charlotte: What other things have you identified in the public documents in their writings, their pronunciations that is coming down the pike. We're looking at population reduction, micro, people won't know it, just like cancers, a lot of illness, just a dwindling population.

Alan: A dwindling population. For the West the population was to be taken down more gradually. For countries like Africa they would be taken down more quickly because they didn't have the power. No one unfortunately really cared and so they could take down Africa quickly and they would bring around this unified world around 2012. That was the date they set for it. The unification of the Americas was to be complete by 2010 and they're on schedule and that was even announced by the Council on Foreign Relations on mainstream television in Canada in 2005.

They came on as the Council on Foreign Relations, said that they had drafted up these treaties that are being signed right now and one per year is to be signed until the final one, 2010, then the unification is complete. The final European unification is to be ratified by the Queen of England next year. That's in the newspapers in Britain.

George: Do you think this is an overly ambitious timeline to get this done?

Alan: No. I mean I know for a fact even talking with people I meet in everyday life when I mention casually the unification when I talk about the money and the dollar dropping and so on. I say they're getting ready to merge with Canada the U.S. dollar and the Canadian dollar is on par pretty well, has been for a long time. Then their reactions were "I guess it's no big deal, we're all much the same anyway" because they've been getting little bits of propaganda through the news. They don't have to do their own thinking about it. The decisions are already made for them and they'll accept it quite happily.

George: The clothing that people wear you know when you look at photographs of people from all over the world they're all wearing the same kind of clothing almost it seems like.

Alan: Yes, because again going back to Plato, where they understood the art of culture creation and alteration, he said that the public always mimic what they see. That's why it was mandatory in ancient Greece that the traveling shows that came along, the drama shows, everyone had to attend including the slaves because they were giving moral plays. As they change morals and upgrade morals and alter them, the people actually mimic what they see on stage. Today we mimic what we see on movies, including fashions.

George: I've got you. Well I wear whatever I can get my hands on I guess. I don't worry about my fashion.

Charlotte: He doesn't look that bad.

George: I look great, don't I Charlotte?

Charlotte: I said you didn't look that bad.

George: Alan looks pretty good. Hey, we're going to cut away and we'll be right back, Alan. Thank you very much. Welcome back to World Review Commentary. This is your host George Butler along with--

Charlotte: Charlotte Littlefield Brown.

George: Welcome back, Alan Watt.

Alan: It's a pleasure.

George: You know you described the system earlier as trying to tell people or educate people into the way it really works, but are there emotional problems or barriers that many people have in trying to get there?

Alan: Absolutely. One of them of course is your indoctrination into patriotism and this is an old technique again going back to the days of Plato where anyone can get to the top and this is why we go to wars. Most of the public don't need any in depth explanation as to why they're going off to fight these bad guys. You simply call them bad guys and give them a little bit of propaganda and then your leaders drape themselves in your tribal emblems that you've been taught are yours, whatever flag it is, the catch phrases, almost like born-again Christians will use. You use certain catch phrases in tribal customs and they're all cheering you before know it and they're ready to go into war and fight whoever you tell them to fight, so they know how to use that. When you realize that you are being used, that your own emotions are being used on such a primitive level to defend the tribe, basically, but not really to defend the tribe, it's for an ulterior purpose to fulfill a minority's agenda – an agenda of world conquest so that the elite as they said 100-odd years ago would take over all the resources of the planet.

Now that means everything you need to live on: all the mineral resources, all of the food resources. That's almost been done and now they're after the water resources. They're actually doing it now. They're taking over the water supplies across the planet into the hands of a few people who are all well connected, very old families, so everything that you need to live for sustenance and so on is owned by them, then you are the worst most abused slave in history. That's what it's boiling down to and until you break this myth that we're all the same. We're not the same whatsoever.

The elite don't make any bones about that at the top. They have no problem talking about the people or the commoners down beneath them, but they keep it going that we're all the same. We are not the same. We're becoming poorer and poorer technically and we're definitely becoming less able to live independently. Our ability for that has been taken away from us piece by piece until they want a world of interdependence. That's means you're not independent. You're interdependent for every need that you require fulfilled, whether it's food, shelter, clothing and so on, you'll be dependent on the system. There are many ways of conquest and people always think of overt warfare. They don't think that most revolutions in the world are quiet and bloodless.

The sexual revolution, the gender revolution, all these revolutions that you have, they're actually cultural revolutions that alter the structure of society and the way we interrelate with each other, but we didn't start them. Other masterminds planned them. We go along with them thinking we're going to get something out of it for ourselves and we end up being worse off generally afterwards than we were when we started. We're being used and manipulated. We're on a chessboard from the day we're born and we don't even know it.

George: Wasn't there a book called "Pawns in the Game" at one time or something like that? My approach on this is that man exists in a mode of delusion by degree and it's hard for us to wake up. We work all of our lives and we're enmeshed in this matrix of education and political indoctrination and stuff, but it's hard for us to come out because of the synergy of these different forces that hold us in this delusion.

Alan: Absolutely. It's been so overwhelming. As I say, children are brought up

now with cartoons that are full of predictive programming, and predictive programming is where thoughts are instilled in your mind primarily through fiction because the censor part of your brain is down. Your shields are down. You're not on guard and so it goes right into your subconscious these ideas that are brought in there through entertainment and then you become familiar with an idea that really is a foreign idea, but when it actually manifests in life, because it's now familiar to you, you think it's a natural progression and you don't fight it. You allow it to happen.

George: It's almost like a disease, isn't it, like if you get the wrong idea in your head it's almost like catching a disease that controls you and debilitates you morally, you know what I mean, physically and psychologically, because you've got a psychosomatic interaction here at times it seems like and so these wrong headed ideas can feed what's wrong in you and control you.

Alan: Completely. That's the whole idea of mind control that Aldous Huxley was really an expert in; and just through massive propaganda the correct indoctrination and the control of all information, all mainstream media, they give you your thoughts. They give you your opinions and technically most folk never think for themselves and that again what Brzezinski said. *"We are creating a system now where the average person will be unable to reason for themselves. They will actually expect the media to do their reasoning for them."* That's happened since he published that book.

George: You know when they started on college campuses and declaring certain areas to be free speech areas, was that the beginning of the end?

Alan: It was. They'd already been at the universities forever to be honest with you. I mean when you look at every university pretty well in Canada and the States they get grants from the big foundations including the Rockefeller Foundations and along with the grants come little mandates of certain things they'd rather you not talk about and certain ideas they'd rather you promote. We've already been under that. The same with public libraries, you think you get all the information in public libraries. Years ago they stopped all that and what they're deciding now is what you'll have access to and what you will not have access to and so the books now in public libraries are generally authorized to be there. Lots of books have been removed from the shelves over the last 10 years.

Charlotte: Eustace Mullins, can his work be found in public libraries still? That would be an interesting test to see.

Alan: I don't know if they're in Canada. I don't know. I know other authors have been taken off of Canadian shelves.

Charlotte: Alan, you made an interesting comment a little while back. You were talking about international news. It was a piece of information you picked up in the British press having to do with somebody I think you said it was the CFR had announced that they're on schedule with the North American Union. Was that what you were--

Alan: Yes. They're on schedule. In fact in 2004 when they signed at Waco, Texas the first open part. Now they've already been setting up for years, but the first

open part came on national television here in Canada. During that ceremony they were asked, the president and two prime ministers were asked, "Is this going to be an amalgamation just the same as Europe?" And of course they tapped danced around that, but then Bush jumped in and he says, "there's nothing wrong in having this international free trade" and so on, but he didn't mention it's also signed into it "the free flow of goods and labor across borders." That's part of the same one of Europe, so that's why they're starting to decrease the borders in certain areas and he said that there'll be another four or five to sign and that takes you up to the year 2010, so that means they're right on schedule.

Charlotte: Let me ask you another question. Where do you think these planes that are dropping the aerosol claims – where you do you think those planes are coming out of? Do you have any idea what country is launching them?

Alan: I'm sure there is more in the U.S. than anywhere else because you've got so much – there's vast territory there and especially desert lands and so on where there are bases where they could have many of them. I've noticed they're white jets. They're military jets, very big jets actually, long and they're white, there's no markings on them. It's interesting when you go back into H.G. Well's book, "***Shape of Things To Come***," remembering that he was a member of this Royal Institute for International Affairs and employed as a propagandist for them who would write predictive programming in novel form. He mentioned in that particular book the two world wars that would come up followed by another one, a final one in the Middle East and he said that the British would begin in Basra and it's true enough. That's where the British are in Iraq right now and that would become the base for a huge international Air Force; and sure enough, they're building the biggest runways and hangars that they even have in the U.S. That's to be the headquarters for this police of the world. He called it "The Freemasons of the Air" and even in his book the job that these planes had to do was go over all the countries and gas them. Spray them from the air.

George: You know I've seen those planes over Kilkenny, Ireland and I've also seen them over London. The operations are worldwide as far as I've been to those countries within the last year and a half, so they are overseas and America.

Alan: I'm thinking too on the scale that they have them and the amounts of chemicals they've been spraying since 1998 across the world, they had to have been starting to make those chemicals back at the end of World War II to have such an incredible stock already to go.

Charlotte: Alan, you personally feel that people with compromised immune systems are susceptible?

Alan: Yes.

Charlotte: Particularly. It's not that they're – it's the people with compromised – the poor food, the antibiotics, the crap that is put into our bodies. Okay I have another question for you when we come back.

George: Can you hold over after the top of the hour for a little while, Alan?

Alan: Sure I can.

George: We'll bring you back and we'll continue that questioning by Charlotte. She's got some crackerjack questions down here for you.

Charlotte: Pop, pop, pop.

George: Boy, you can answer them too, Alan. Thank you very much.

HOOR 3:

Charlotte: Welcome back to World Review Commentary. This is Charlotte Littlefield Brown with George Butler. We're broadcasting live from the fourth floor museum the former location or the historical location of the Texas book depository and our guest is Alan Watt. Alan, thank you for continuing on with us.

Alan: Yes, I'm glad to be here.

Charlotte: I have a question for you. I find all this information very sobering and one of my questions is - we know we've got approximately 200 CFR's in the federal system and leadership positions setting the agenda et cetera. How many of these elitists, for failure of a better word I'm just going to call them elitists, the people that are aware that there's population reduction underway and all the brainwashing and not just brainwashing, mind control. How many do they number do you think? Is it 5,000, 6,000? Have you ever sat down to contemplate physically how many of these people, how large it is, including the regular people that they've brought into their circle?

Alan: Including them, I'm sure you've got maybe all together - they say three percent of the world's population own the world. They own it financially, three percent.

Charlotte: Three percent of the total 6-point-whatever billion it is you think?

Alan: That's right. Three percent own the wealth of the planet and the same 3 percent they're also taking over the food supply. That's the big Heinz and all these big ones and agri-food businesses, Archer Daniel Midlands, Monsanto all these companies, ConAgra. They own the food supplies of the world too. You've just seen the wife of Rothschild in a partnership with her husband has just taken over the vast tracts of India. They put the old farmers out of business. They're taking over the land and they're going to start exporting their own brands of foods, which are modified, to the world from India. They own the pharmaceutical industries and the banking industries of the planet. You always find that the same families that own the banks also own pharmaceutical industries and you can go back to ancient Egypt and find the same there. It's the same darn thing, same MO [modus operandi]. Three percent roughly own it all. There's a three percent of the world's population at any one time they figure are aware of what's really happening but they're powerless to do it because they don't have the wealth to push or oppose it.

Seven percent of the population comprise the military, the bureaucrats, the police

and so on to keep this system in operation, to enforce the system. That means that the rest of the public are just the masses, who are totally conditioned in all ages, who go with whatever flow they're told to go with, and that's why they chose a front called democracy because they said many years ago that the vast majority of the public will always go and vote the way they want them to do so. That's why they chose this front of democracy.

Charlotte: Sure. It would keep the people calm also.

George: It sounds good, doesn't it? I mean we're going to give everyone a vote but we're going to use these electronic machines that we can control the outcome, right?

Alan: It wouldn't matter as long as they have the right to groom and present to the public the candidates that definitely will be selected, not the outsiders.

George: It's also a big play. It's like a Broadway musical or something. It's been scripted and being directed.

Alan: That's what Quigley said. He said that all presidents and prime ministers are picked by the Royal Institute for International Affairs or the Council on Foreign Relations. They're picked in advance, of all parties, and their advisers too are picked. That's all they have to have. He says the lesser politicians down beneath them they're allowed to debate within each other for brownie points for their careers as long as the ones at the top belong to that royal society, that Royal Institute for International Affairs, so the agenda is set anyway. That's why and I knew this growing up. I saw different parties going in and out, and conservative and labor and so on, and I saw the same world agendas put out by the United Nations with each change of government carry forward with this agenda without a hitch, regardless of who seemed to be in power. It never faltered. Now why hasn't a party ever gone into power and just tossed out all the laws that the last bunch made if they were all wrong? It doesn't happen.

George: Once they join the club of big government then they get bigger. They consolidate power on a stateist or a centralist basis, federalist type of systems and they won't let up because they benefit themselves and it's this false self, this glorified self that they seem to be feeding I guess.

Alan: It's also the agenda because Karl Marx wrote about it. The first thing you must do, he said, is to create nationalism before you have communism or socialism, you create nationalism because that centralizes power in one main place, then once you have nationalism and you've given the same system across the world you create treaties that bind them towards world government, towards a singular government. The essence was to create centralized government first of all by bringing in nationalism, and that's really what your civil war was all about. It was to bring in centralized government and control and that's why Karl Marx telegraphed Lincoln congratulating him in saving the union, he said because it's imperative to have centralized government. That's in your Congressional records.

George: You know we were in Washington, D.C. a couple of weeks ago. We went in the Lincoln Memorial and inside there it says "The Temple." Isn't that what the inscription on the wall says? I believe it described that building as a temple.

Alan: It is.

Charlotte: I know the one I like is at the Jefferson Memorial. It says something along the lines of "on the altar of God I swear my undying hostility to any government attempt to control the minds of free men."

George: Boy, I like that one.

Charlotte: That's my favorite.

George: Hey, I'll go for that. Charlotte has a way of getting through the bottom line, you know that Charlotte?

Alan: You should also around and look at the Masonic rotunda they put up after Kennedy was shot where you are there, because you'll see the obelisk there and its reflection in the water. They always have an obelisk with its reflection in the water. That's the sun and the moon. That's the male, the female and the little flame coming out of the top of the obelisk, although it's in stone, meaning the seed is pure that goes on with the next generation of that lineage.

Charlotte: Let me ask you this, Alan. How did they allow - I don't mean to challenge what we're talking about but if they are in so much control how come they couldn't - how did the population get as large as it did?

Alan: They weren't sure how many wars they'd have to fight to bring about world government. They were keeping incredible statistics during World War I and II and then during the Korean War too and they realized that eventually around the time of Korea they didn't need as many troops as they were always breeding up the next generation of troops. They didn't need as many as they had before, especially since the U.S. had been given - authorized by Britain to take over the role of Britain in pushing for this world government. They would finance it from the U.S. They would supply the troops. They would be policemen of the world and they wrote about this as far back as the 1930's and in '38 in Sydney, Australia the big meeting there they talked about the U.S. being the world's policemen after this coming war with Germany. Then after that they said that the U.S. will come forward in strength on a couple of occasions, falter, and then go forward, and then falter finally back and submerge itself, then China was to take over from the U.S. as the policemen of the world.

George: Wars have been helpful in mobilizing people and organizing people around a common enemy and so forth, but now as far as being efficient in reducing the population, have they really been able to reduce the population in any great number?

Alan: Yes, absolutely. When you look into many of the books - I've got books from 1910 onwards. There were tremendous arguments back then because the British population had not only been steady but actually falling. People in Britain were obeying and doing what they were told and Charles Galton Darwin said it in his book, he says, we can convince the people to go after material goods, it means we'll have to give them more money; and they really hated to do that. They'd

rather take it all from you. He said to pay up for a motor car, an automobile, he says they might be willing to forego a child; and sure enough, the population in Britain had been dropping drastically for many, many years. So much so that Maggie Thatcher when she opened up the floodgates to immigration, mainly from India, her excuse in the papers was that there's not enough people being born in Britain to pay off the national debt. So even when you obey and you're very good and you reduce your population, they open the doors and bring it right back up and beyond with foreign immigration. Most of statistics they're giving you in the U.S. is from immigrants. That's why it seems to go higher. It's all from immigration and they know this and it's the same in the whole Western world. That's the main reason for immigration; it's partly to fool the public, cram them all into the cities, give you the feeling of overpopulation, while you really have less and less children all the time.

George: Also coupled with this you have a change in fertility rates? You were saying earlier in the interview that our fertility rates are down substantially.

Alan: Men are three quarters sterile.

George: So that's going to take care of some of the population by degree there also.

Alan: Another part of it - you see the fastest growing industry in the U.S. and Canada and the Western world is actually fertility clinics, because not only the men are dropping with this being infertile, women too are coming down with lots of - mainly from Candida and different other strains that they're getting from promiscuity. The fallopian tubes are becoming blocked. These particular infections travel all over the ovaries and they cause tremendous problems there. We have been attacked and that's part of the reason I'm sure they encourage promiscuity was to - including herpes and all the other things that came out of nowhere. I'm sure these are all man-made diseases. If you to bring change through a war, you see it's a war to reduce the population. What do you do in a war? You use weaponry and we know that the easiest thing that they can do, they've written books on it, is to create new types of viruses and bacterium; and then what do you do? How do you get the public to actually do it? You encourage promiscuity.

George: How about AIDS? Is that one of the mechanisms also?

Alan: I have no doubt. I have no doubt at all. I mean Kissinger I think it was in '73 declared that the greatest threat to the state of the nation, he says, the greatest threat is overpopulation and then he allocated millions of dollars towards finding ways to find something which would destroy the immune system of people.

George: It does that I guess. I mean is it getting worse worldwide? Now you said Africa was one of the countries that was disseminated population-wise. Is that still continuing there?

Alan: Yes it is and it's worse in certain areas than in others. I think Zaire has an incredible rate of it. Many documentaries have been put out by even official sources on it. They're dying even faster now that we've given them all these drugs. We're all paying now, the U.S., Canada and Britain, we're paying to give drugs that will not be used here because they're so lethal, so they're dropping even

faster with these drugs that we're giving them.

George: We had a missionary over in Malawi. It's a little country there, Lake Malawi and the country's name is Malawi and this was 20, 25 years ago. She stayed at a church during one Wednesday evening dinner. At that point, at that time 25 years ago Malawi had a 20 percent AIDS rate of prenatal women.

Alan: It's terrible.

George: I don't know what they have now. It was one of the earlier countries with a high rate of AIDS.

Alan: Yes and the problem too is when you're seeing the documentaries on it, the youngsters there have been given the western culture - what they think is Western culture. They wear their hats on backwards. They get all this stuff flown to them by the U.N., the baggy pants and transistor radios and iPods and so on, and they make their own booze at night and that's all they do is copy what they think the West does and they're promiscuous and it's a disaster. However, I think it's a planned disaster because going back and reading the writings of the top economists from the days of Thomas Malthus, who worked for the Crown of England and who worked for the East India Company and so on, and then John Stewart Mill, they actually put categories of people that would have to be annihilated because they would not be able to fit in with the white man's economic structure and they carry along under the Darwinist theories. The Darwinist theories that "inferior types" as they called them that came into a superior culture - if a superior culture didn't destroy them they'd be brought down by the inferior. They had categories of people. We're talking about the ultimate racism here and they are racist at the top. They are eugenicists at the top and they have given lists of people that would have to be eradicated, including the American Indians. Any culture that would not adopt or they called it "mimic" the white man's system would have to perish.

Charlotte: I feel sick to my stomach.

George: We're talking about not only a culture, a consolidation of culture you would say, worldwide, with certain ideas in common there. We're dressing the same it seems like all over the world now, but you're saying that there's coming about a new cultural world culture. Is that basically what you're saying?

Alan: That's exactly it. That's what Brzezinski talked about in his book, the creation of a world culture. There's books just coming out now, 50 years after the event, with declassified information - it's always about 50 years after the event because the public don't care what happened in the past - admitting that CIA and London, England with MI6 and 5 with branches all across Europe as well created the 20th century culture, music, arts, entertainment and so on. They financed it. They decided what you'd see, what things you would hear about, what you would mimic, et cetera. They gave us the culture. The culture is not our own.

Charlotte: Alan, that brings me to a question. After the break, perhaps when we come back, maybe you can tell us how do you think our culture would have evolved? What would a more natural evolution look like and is there any possibility?

George: Hey Alan, I can't wait for your answer on this one, okay? We're going to take a break and we'll be right back, Alan. Thank you very much. Welcome back to World Review Commentary. I'm George Butler along with...

Charlotte: Charlotte Littlefield Brown.

George: We're broadcasting live from the Texas School Book Depository and it fronts right on Dealey Plaza. We're commemorating the memory of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who was assassinated here out on the street November 22, 1963. Alan, welcome back to our program.

Alan: I'm glad to be here.

George: I think Charlotte put a question on you, didn't she?

Charlotte: You've done a tremendous amount of research and I was wondering surely you've had some – you've formed some opinions or thoughts on that matter.

Alan: Absolutely and it's not so easy. It's definitely not so easy. When we go back to realize that people like Bertrand Russell, who was a big player with Tavistock and this whole culture creation business, when he said that we shall create a hedonistic narcissistic society where people will be disassociated from each other; I have to agree, it has been successful. People live in their little boxes isolated pretty well from each other. We've seen the wars on families and everything else where people are dysfunctional. Families are often dysfunctional, especially when they still watch mainstream entertainment. It's meant to make you dysfunctional because you will mimic what you see on stage. Then they've been very, very successful and we've never been given the option to decide what kind of society we would like. The public have never been given this and as I say that's one of the reasons that the Royal Institute's that Margaret Thatcher called this International Affairs Institute and the Council on Foreign Relations that Thatcher called herself too. She said this is a parallel government of ex-presidents and prime ministers who are unelected by the people and therefore they can have their power behind the scenes, the real power but not the appearance of power. That's why they had already decided the public could never ever make decisions on their own because they were too divisive. There were too many irreconcilable problems between races, religions, and so on.

Charlotte: That's what *they* said, right?

Alan: That's right.

Charlotte: I mean that is not necessarily reality.

Alan: It's not really and yet it is too, because they intensified any differences amongst the peoples. They've often been behind funding the groups that caused racial tensions and even gender tensions and all the rest of it. In fact the CIA ran the feminist movement and funded it from the beginning.

Charlotte: Sure. The good news—It's hard to stomp out goodness.

Alan: Yes, it's hard and yet the indoctrination at least in one generation is still with them and people go through what they call "routines." They don't really talk from the heart. What they do is they go through their repertoires and routines that have been instilled in them full of slogans et cetera and they start arguing before you know it because they've been programmed. People have been programmed and most folk--

George: Yes, you sort of seed into your own children what you've been subjected too, right? Not knowing how good or bad it might be?

Charlotte: Well here's my experience as a mother is that I believe that my children were born in an essential goodness and that I interfered on behalf of my culture in a lot of ways. Like, for example, don't touch that, it does not belong to you. You know these things that I passed on to them. Of course, I'm not all-powerful. The media has already stepped in. They were involved in the raising of my children from early on. I have a rule at my house and when I was growing up my dad said that the television was broke, but in fact he cut the end off.

George: Oh, that was wicked. Wasn't that bad, Alan?

Charlotte: I grew up to be an electrician so that I could fix that cord, but I understood the wisdom later and of course I've gone years in my household where - in fact just this past year there has been no television allowed.

George: It's un-American to be against television.

Charlotte: I will allow and you're absolutely right. People parrot. George had a wonderful little bird that flies back and forth on his website and it's the secret truth website, another show. It says that the world's full of parrots and it's true. We don't - we aren't allowed to think for ourselves. It's very cruel that when people do have that curiosity within them that they go on their hunt to find information and to find things and they end up in quagmire and they're definitely not supported. Independent people and independent thinking is absolutely not embraced in our culture right now.

Alan: Yes it's not. In fact as part of the charter of the United Nations, they're against individualism. They're against it because you cannot control an individual.

George: With a collective you can manage a collective more easily.

Charlotte: And children, going back to the natural state of a human being, when they're young a child will play with any other human being. It doesn't matter.

Alan: Doesn't matter who they are.

Charlotte: It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter what they look like. It doesn't matter, anything, whatsoever, children will play with other children, period, and there's a tendency to share. Not always but there is tendency to - because you can't have enjoyment if you're all by yourself, so children will seek other children to cooperate with so that they can have fun. I'm not saying that they won't share

their toys and stuff like that, but this concept – when I was in college they taught me that economics – what was the meaning of economics? It was the managing of limited resources, the balance between limited resources and unlimited wants and desires, or needs and desires or whatever.

George: It sounds like sustainable development of growth to me.

Charlotte: Yes, but that very basis of that definition how we define what society is, frankly that did not fit well with me. It doesn't fit well with me today. I don't know that I initially have all the right answers and the directions to go, but the language is a very tricky thing and of course we've been controlled by it, but I think we can start on helping other people by the language that we use, and Alan, I have to compliment you. You are one of the most well spoken people.

George: He's a wordsmith primo.

Charlotte: You're a phenomenal communicator and you're a man of your time and we greatly appreciate everything that you're doing to help everybody understand more clearly what's happening to us.

George: This language thing, the neuron-linguistic programming or something like that, I guess words have power, don't they?

Alan: Tremendous power and they've known this for thousands of years and that's why they put it into the holy books: "in the beginning was the word," because the word when spoken it has tremendous impact on the recipient. They knew these sciences again thousands of years ago. That's why even in ancient Greece there was one language for the common people and those professional orators – professional orators were licensed in ancient Greece and Rome. They had licenses because what they could say and how they could put it over to the public could literally have wars beginning on the establishment if they decided to do so, so they limited the ordinary peoples vocabulary. It's called "linguistic minimalism" and if you noticed even the dictionaries for the last 150 years have been getting thinner and thinner and thinner as they would take words out of the dictionaries and you end up with linguistic minimalism, where you cannot convey a complete thought to another. You see, that's the purpose of it. In George Orwell's "**1984**" he has a scene in there in that book where the Department of Words and the dictionary are discussing that very thing and then one man pipes in. He says, "*I see, brother.*" He says, "*so when there's no more words there can be no more crime thought,*" which is true. If you can't think and you don't have the words to express a thought, you could never be accused of thinking out a crime. That's how absurd it would get towards the end.

George: The department of partial thoughts, right?

Alan: That's right and if you notice today, that's what's coming along the pike. They're putting in all these systems. They want to test everyone, annually eventually, adults too, and give them psychological testing to see if you have wrong think, right think and all the rest of it. That's coming and we sit back and we think we can't believe it's coming, but it actually is coming, like everything else that seems so absurd until they introduce it. It's just like the inoculations in

Maryland there now is compulsory. You can't believe it but it's happening.

George: Didn't they call 2,000 people into some courtroom the other day? Where was that, in Maryland or where was it?

Alan: I think it was in Maryland. So it's coming and then you go back all the way to the League of Nations and that was a mandate of theirs was to ensure that the public would take all of the inoculations they decided to give them.

George: Can you hold over until 1 o'clock Central time?

Alan: Sure I can.

George: A couple of more segments and then we'll finish it up and we've got some people coming in from COPA. Hang in there. We're going to be right back, Alan. This is getting better and better all the time. Thank you, sir. Welcome back to World Review Commentary. I'm George Butler along with...

Charlotte: Charlotte Littlefield.

George: We're broadcasting live from the Texas School Book Depository here in Dallas, Texas at 411 Elm Street. Come on down here and examine this library. They have several good displays and exhibitions. Don't they have one about the assassination, possible different explanations of it?

Charlotte: There's a wall here of about six different theories.

George: I'd say about six different ones and then COPA (Coalition on Political Assassinations) is meeting here in Dallas. We're going to be interviewing John Judge at 1 o'clock in about 30 minutes and he's the one of the organizers of the COPA, which stands for (Coalition on Political Assassinations). Right now we've been talking to and talking with and listening to very intensely Alan Watt. Welcome back to our program, Alan.

Alan: It's a pleasure to be here.

George: This system the way I describe it sometimes is that we're embedded in a system of electromagnetic radiation that surrounds us and that's a mechanism by which is used to impregnate or convey into us or transmit into us certain ideas.

Alan: Absolutely it's the best; television alone is the best tool ever created and they simply want to go the next step of having transmissions going directly into your brain. That's also in the UN treaty on Weather Warfare because that's one of the effects they could induce is a secondary signal on the main carrier signal of the HAARP facilities. They can actually put thoughts into your head.

George: What I have, I have an idea I call grand unification of reality and what it does it takes all these synergistic inputs and ideas and influences and analyzes those and says what's really going on here and that's really what you've been doing over your whole lifetime looking at those different factors. Is that true?

Alan: That is true. You have to look at everything that goes in to your reality or your culture and you realize as I say now it's even been admitted. That helps an awful lot that it's admitted to that your culture is created for you. Plato even talked about it. It's given by the top down because anything that's grassroots could have unforeseen events – it could have ripple events going through the society and those at the top would lose control, therefore they knew thousands of years ago that all culture had to be given from the top, authorized by the top and led by the top, all the changes within culture. Plato talked about the fashion industry, the music industry and the drama industry 2,300 years ago how they were so influential in directing the thoughts and the behavior of those who viewed and listened and watched.

Charlotte: What do you think about the way the entertainers are paraded in front of us? My daughters, I try to explain it to them. I said well they're people and we celebrate them so we call them celebrities, and maybe some day and I celebrate you and whatever, but it's a very interesting phenomenon. There's a lot of speculation about Britney Spears and that she's a mind control victim.

George: People know more about these entertainers and these stars than they know about what really counts it seems like.

Alan: That's the idea. You see, we as the masses, the masses follow the stars. It's like in the old occultic, so they give you stars.

George: Hey, I've been trying to look for a star but it's over clouded here.

Alan: That's right and sometimes you get a fallen star and they always get them back up there again. We follow the stars and just a tongue-in-cheek way of describing the occult systems that run our world. The holy wood, the holly wood, the staff of the holly tree, ancient symbols of the occult and that's why they call the place Hollywood. In the '60's they had an international meeting in England that went for weeks with the CFR (the Council on Foreign Relations), all the big moguls of media were in it and entertainment and the ones in Britain for the Royal Institute for International Affairs. It was in the newspapers at the time and they said the purpose was to decide which country would be given the task to push a world culture through entertainment primarily on the people of the world, and they concluded eventually they'd give the job primarily to Hollywood. Sure enough, Hollywood and the music industry, much music et cetera is what's drummed into the youngsters including the cartoon industry. They even have cartoon series now coming out in Japan we'll see here shortly and it's about youngsters who can't find a woman and they bond with these cyborg females. This is all to get us used to the idea that nothing is normal anymore. When there's no normal, there's nothing to compare normal to, then you'll accept the next step and the next step: the cloned humans, the partially cloned humans, all of that stuff. That's what the whole thing has been about for the last 30-odd years or so. When you have nothing to compare normalcy to, it's easy to get you in flux and then they can bring more and more changes and new types of humans forward very quickly and we won't really complain so much because we'll be so confused what is normal.

George: They've tried to take away standards and I guess that's basically what you just said that standards have gone by the wayside and so it's social moral,

relativist view. Anything goes. There are no standards. There are not set principles. I mean you sort of learn as you go and it's situation ethics, right? Just sort of pick up your feelings. Get in touch with your feelings right?

Alan: That's it.

George: Not when you reason. Not with reason or logic but sort of feel good. It's a feely good society it sounds like.

Alan: Narcissism. It's narcissist, feel good. Always rationalize whatever you do for your own ego sake. Save your ego and that's actually the definition of a psychopath. They have given us a psychopathic culture to follow. In fact, we live in a psychopathic culture worldwide with money, where there's never enough for most folk and we try and emulate those at the top. Once again, the stars at the top that you're given to follow and we call it success. When you claw, stab and cunningly get to the top you're successful, which means there's an awful lot of people at the bottom that are unsuccessful. It's about winners and losers, so that's not a natural humane system. This is a psychopathic system that they gave us a long time ago.

Charlotte: I'll agree with that. I think children they want to play together and of course there's all kinds of studies that say that will eventually go into competition or whatever. Have you followed any of Jordan Maxwell's work? He did a piece and it's viewable on Google online. It's "The Occult World of Commerce."

Alan: I haven't seen that one.

Charlotte: Oh Alan, I would highly recommend. It's quite a laugh. As knowledgeable as you are, you might find it actually a little bit of humor in all this sadness. What about - there's an Irish person that originates from Ireland. His name is Michael Tsarion. He runs with Jordan Maxwell. What do you know about him?

Alan: Well, I'll just say this--

Charlotte: Well, he's out there. I mean he's out there. I'd love to know what you think.

Alan: I'll just say this about these people. They all know each other very well. They all come out with intelligence, which is truth, but then they always tack on the same endings to it, which throws you off into outer space, which is counter intelligence as far as I view it. That's my opinion, right? When people want to find truth you must be careful what you let in, because you are the guard of your own mind and they can be very persuasive and often they come out, too, with what seems to be certain information for the first time. That's what generally grabs people, but they all know each other. I can't tell you too much actually about this, but I've had offers to go along with certain things where I'd be heavily financed. Guaranteed best selling books and so on if I would just go along with the usual conspiracy stuff and bring in the alien agenda at the end and I've refused it.

Charlotte: I see, I see. Okay.

George: So what you're saying in several cases is not what people really want to hear. Do people want to hear the truth or not, the real truth?

Alan: They'll want to hear it but you have professional people out there that can start off the right way, which as I say is intelligence, but then they'll – why spin it off into something you could never alter? If this was aliens, for instance, right, then find me an alien so I can complain and change things; because that will never happen, which means that you leave the politicians and social activism alone. What's the point if aliens are doing it, right? It's the same thing – if it's written in the stars then it's predictive programming. It's fate. There's nothing you can do.

Charlotte: What about David Icke? Of course is the person that comes to mind when you say the alien thing. So you feel that he basically – okay I get it. I don't have to say it out loud but he basically ended with the alien conclusion.

Alan: First you grab your audience. You get the fans and then you spin it. I've seen over the years with different ones and 20 years ago, one man was set out to start the foundations that they all build on top with his own special interpretations of the Sumerian tablets which is absolute nonsense.

George: We'll be right back, Alan. We've got to take a short break. We'll end up this hour. Thank you very much. Welcome back to World Review Commentary. This is your host George Butler along with...

Charlotte: Charlotte Littlefield Brown.

George: Charlotte, what do you think about the sixth floor museum? It's here within the Texas School Book Depository building in Dallas, Texas at 411 Elm Street. They have quite an exhibit here.

Charlotte: Right. I can tell you they've added a seventh floor where they showcase all the films from the general public who was welcoming the president, so they've got films coming in all the time. When I say film I don't mean scripted, these are home movies from that time period and as people pass away they're in their wills. I know a lot of people pass them on to the museum for posterity I guess.

George: We talked to several people about the sixth floor museum and originally it may have had more of a monolithic or one-headed view but now they're trying to open up themselves to allow a few more ideas about what really went on here on November 22, 1963, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was assassinated right out in front on the street here. Right close to the Texas School Book Depository and there's great controversy how that really went down. Earlier we had been talking with Alan Watt and welcome back to our program, Alan Watt.

Alan: It's a pleasure to be here with you.

George: You've been here and really looked at this before in detail, have you not?

Alan: Yes. It's an occult slaying.

George: The symbols mean a lot to you, don't they, these different symbols that have been created around here?

Alan: Oh, no doubt, absolutely. That was picked for a display of a sacrifice to the whole planet. The whole world saw that on television.

Charlotte: Alan, do you think that they actually – this particular location was designed – because there's a triangle. You know like you said the symbolism. The dragon on the bank and the location of the pyramid and the arch and these occultic symbology. Here's what I'm trying to get at is how deep is this? Was this something like okay we'll have this set up over here in case we ever have to knock someone off. We'll do it over here, or was it just that we have so much of these types of structures and it's so persuasive in our culture?

Alan: You do have so many in the states. The U.S. has so many of them it's just staggering.

Charlotte: Yes it is. I mean of course Washington, D.C., all the symbology there. The question I guess I'm asking is do you think that this area was prepared or it just happens to be that it was so persuasive that it fit the bill for what they needed?

Alan: That particular location definitely fitted the bill, even to do with where the car would slow, where it would speed up, even though they didn't follow instructions. All these drivers are taught when anything goes wrong they hit the accelerator. This guy actually slowed down. You're right enough; they have this triangle really, these three roads all converging into one. Again, the trident of old Neptune and that place at one time I believe was flooded that area.

Charlotte: George noticed that where the president was the bullets actually hit him was on a slope. It's going down and where the fence was was actually at a higher angle so it was quite a clear shot. George estimated about 75 feet and I would agree with that, and additionally the front end of the car was on a decline, so it was easier, clear.

George: The windshield would not present a barrier to any frontal shot.

Charlotte: There we go.

George: See what I mean?

Alan: That's right.

George: Because the front of the car was lower than the back, so the front windshield would not present any kind of a problem to anyone shooting from the front at the car. That's what I seen.

Alan: Sure. There's no doubt on that, plus whatever hit him had to be high velocity and the Carcano rifle that Oswald supposedly had was a mail-order rifle that had not been altered and Carcano was one of the worst inaccurate rifles ever

made.

George: And the action on it was not that good.

Alan: Bolt action, heavy and to put off three rapid shots and never lose your target and a moving target at that distance is just - even the military said it was pretty well impossible with that actual rifle.

George: They've got Bob Groden over here at this meeting here being held at the Lawrence Hotel here in Dallas and so he's an authority on photographic evidence. They've got quite a bit at this COPA meeting that's taking place. They have quite a few. The Coalition on Political Assassinations is what's happening. It's a regional meeting. It's November 22 through the 25th here at the Lawrence Hotel in Dallas, Texas, and they've got quite a few speakers and we're going to be interviewing one soon, but the speech that we started off we sort of cheated a little bit. I know maybe you didn't hear exactly what we did on that speech. Did you hear the beginning of that or not?

Alan: Not the very beginning, no.

Charlotte: George did a War of the Worlds on it.

George: Yeah, we did a War of the Worlds but we were there at the speech.

Charlotte: George set it up. He said that it's April 27th--

George: I said welcome to the Waldorf Astoria and I'm George Butler reporting along with Charlotte Littlefield, and I named the date and I said our President would be speaking here momentarily. We had the presidential hail to the chief and all that, okay? We tried to attract attention in this way you know? In other words, that speech is like you said on your site that you described that speech it's so insightful and so people need to really look at that speech and we were just trying to think of some way that we could maybe introduce that speech to people in a little bit different way, you know?

Alan: It is. I mean you have a president talking about a secret society that really does not believe in democracy because they said democracy is so powerful democratic countries really cannot go against it. It's so powerful and in democratic countries you have certain laws and so on you have to go through to do anything, whereas these characters don't have to. They can just go over all laws and pull off whatever they wish to pull off, as was demonstrated with Kennedy's killing, and yet this cloak of silence that comes round the whole darn thing. They even have, apart from the occultic symbology and the dragons on top of the courthouse and so on, the three unworthy craftsmen. You always have three unworthy craftsmen where you're pulling off a big stunt for the Great Work and so you have the three tramps there, the vagrants coming off the train.

George: Oh yes. Is that what they're for?

Alan: And the 9/11 deal the mainstream media said there were three Jews on top of a building taking photographs. They were lifted. There's always three and even

in Jack the Ripper he talks about the unworthy "*Jewes*," that's what they call it in High Masonry, the three unworthy craftsmen. That's what it really means. You always have the same symbology around these high occultic assassinations.

Charlotte: Alan, do you think that we are going to have another strike against us?

Alan: If it takes a strike to make you get to your knees and obey the next set of rules it will happen. They'll stop at nothing because they have a war on the public and it's by any means possible. In fact that was one of the tenants that Cecil Rhodes brought into the Rhodes Society that became the Royal Institute for International Affairs. The end justifies the means, so whatever is necessary will be done to make it so.

Charlotte: They've got to find this boring, I mean, or not boring, but what do they want? The power, the money? They've got it all.

Alan: They believe that they are the most evolved people on the planet, and they're psychopathic but they don't see themselves being unnatural. They go by the laws of nature where they look at the animal world the food chain and the high predators at the top of the food chain so they don't see themselves as psychopathic. They see themselves as the natural inheritors of the earth with the right to rule the lessers; the profane they call them, those in the darkness, those who can't figure things out, the inferior or "junk genes" as they quip amongst themselves. Plato called them the ITS. The general population were called ITS, they were not human, so you have this incredible eugenics, a form of racism or class racism at the top which they're proud of, really believing that they are the inheritors of the world who have always power, at least within the monied system going back thousands of years. They've run the royalties. The royalties are all part of it. They've run the monied system in all of its forms, down through the ages, and its commerce as well, and it runs society and so they plan and direct the future. The only problem they've had down through the ages is the fact they had to have given massive ongoing indoctrination to keep the people dumb and stupid and it would be much easier if they could just simply create new types of humans to be servants and workers that will cost less to feed and do more work and so on and cannot think for themselves. That's the object of the new type of human they want to bring in.

George: So instead of trans-humanism manifesting in a higher evolved, that can also occur. It can go where they can evolve themselves through trans-humanism techniques to a higher level and then devolve the other part of it, the worker part to a lower level.

Alan: Yes.

Charlotte: Alan, gosh is this it? I wanted to ask you a question about the bible. Obviously they brought us our religion, right?

Alan: Yes, there's no doubt. They boast about it at the top.

George: Alan Watt, thank you very much for your interview and your time and

most of all, your work in this area. You're trying to enlighten the world and trying to bring the world out of this delusion, this ignorant state, and you've done a really fine job in doing this. You seem tireless in all the endeavors that you do and everything else, we thank you so very much, Alan Watt. Thank you.

Alan: It's been a pleasure to be on and give me a call after you're finished and I'll tell you a few things I haven't mentioned.

George: Okay sir. I'll certainly do that. Thank you, Alan Watt.

Alan: Bye now.

George: Bye-bye.

(Transcribed by Linda)